Exhibit 4

Message

From: James Dearth [JDearth@WhitestoneCC.com]
Sent: 3/6/2018 1:56:38 PM
To: 'ex02@yuandacn.com' [ex02@yuandacn.com]
CC: 谭明华 [charles_tan@126.com]; Phil Carvelas [pcarvelas@WhitestoneCC.com]; Steven Grzic [SGrzic@WhitestoneCC.com]; junhuijia2002 [junhuijia2002@yahoo.com]; Pawel Lepkowski [PLepkowski@WhitestoneCC.com]
Subject: RE: RE: CUNY - Building movement @ WT-3 IMPORTANT
Importance: High

Yuan,

From the project documents including structural drawings, specifications and RFI's, could Yuanda (or anyone) have derived the relative movements between the two buildings and identified such a great difference in movement? In other words, is there enough information provided for one to identify the different building movements to the point where we should have asked the question to define the difference?

We need to find facts and define a time line showing the design omission in order to have the client bear the cost of the remediation activity.

Regards,

James Dearth
Whitestone Construction Corp.
50-52 49th Street
Woodside, NY 11377
Tel: 718-392-1800
Cell: 347-395-7028
Fax: 718-392-6262

From: ex02@yuandacn.com [mailto:ex02@yuandacn.com]
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 2:18 AM
To: James Dearth <JDearth@WhitestoneCC.com>
Cc: 谭明华 <charles_tan@126.com>; Phil Carvelas <pcarvelas@WhitestoneCC.com>; Steven Grzic <SGrzic@WhitestoneCC.com>; junhuijia2002 <junhuijia2002@yahoo.com>; Pawel Lepkowski <PLepkowski@WhitestoneCC.com>; ex02 <ex02@yuandacn.com>
Subject: 回复: RE: CUNY - Building movement @ WT-3 IMPORTANT

James
When Yuanda making the PMU, I communicated with WCC for several times about the displacement issue of each system. In the email communication, it said that the vertical displacement of WT3 system was not considered in the PMU. In subsequent communication, WCC did not ask about the vertical displacement of WT3 system. In 2017, when the email talked about this issue, Yuanda had fabricated and shipped out all materials for WT3 system, and I thought that WCC should have completed the installation of the WT3 material at that time.

If following the architect's comment, please see the details which indexed A351 and A352 in the A320.
1. Just the glass rib connections at the top are adjustable, the rest positions are fixed, and such kind of situation will cause most glass rib can't be installed, even though a small part can be installed, in the later use process due to the asynchronous deformation of the system, which will cause the damage of the glass rib. Therefore, the system we used is that the upper end of glass rib is fixed and lower end is adjustable.

2. With respect to the conflict between the stainless steel plate and bracket, WCC can refer to the fabrication drawings of stainless steel plate previously provided by Yuanda, at the steel bracket position, the aluminum angle is disconnected, and the stainless steel flange is also notched at this position, the purpose is to avoid the conflict between the stainless steel plate and bracket. In the current structure form, the steel bracket move down 1/2″ has no problem, if you want to move more, the only result is the bottom of the bracket contact with the top of the sealant, and the sealant stretch down a bit.

We hope WCC could also have a analysis on above explanation.

Best Regards,
Yuan Yue

---

ex02@yuandacn.com

发件人： James Dearth
发送时间： 2018-02-14 05:46
收件人： 'ex02@yuandacn.com'
抄送： 谭明华; Phil Carvelas; Steven Grzic; 'jason jia'; Pawel Lepkowski
主题： RE: 回复: CUNY - Building movement @ WT-3 IMPORTANT

Yuan,

The relative building movement has become a substantial issues that needs to be addressed as soon as possible. Kindly respond to the questions below.

1. During the design phase of the WT-3 wall system, was the worst case combination of the independent movements of the two building taken into consideration? If so, please indicate on which page(s) of the approved calculation indicate that analysis.
a. Note: This exercise is required per specification (084426.1.03.B.3.a)
b. Detail 3/A-351.00 clearly shows the glass at the clerestory curb dead loaded on the sill extrusion
c. Detail 1/A-351.00 shows a connection between extrusion and structure with a slotted connection that could potentially indicate that it's design intent is for vertical movement.
   i. Why was a different extrusion profile provided on the project that did not allow for vertical movement at the top connection between the steel and aluminum extrusion?
2. In your email below you state that the system movement was specified and provided to Yuanda for wall types WT1 and WT-8. Were the movement criteria provided for WT-3 (other than in 2017)? (see below in yellow)
a. If the movement criteria was provided in the 084426 specification or other form of communication like an RFI, kindly advise what the provided movements criteria for the WT-3 wall system was and how the information was provided to Yuanda.
3. See page 3 of 6 on building movement package showing Yuanda proposed connection fix (D331). Proposed fix will not work due to continuous interior SS cladding conflicting with SG09 bracket during building movements
a. See pages 4 thru 6 for other design concepts that may work.

We obviously want to resolve this issue without any remedial work to the building as it is complete in this area. If there is any way Yuanda can prove that the system is able to accommodate the movement or a time line explaining why it doesn't, that would greatly help the situation.
Please respond as soon as time allows to this urgent matter. We need to resolve this issue very soon due to the building occupancy certificate dependent on this resolution.

Regards,

James Dearth
Project Manager
Whitestone Construction Corp.
50-52 49th Street
Woodside, NY 11377
Tel: 718-392-1800
Cell: 347-395-7028
Fax: 718-392-6262

From: ex02@yuandacn.com [mailto:ex02@yuandacn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2017 5:13 AM
To: Pawel Lepkowski <PLepkowski@WhitestoneCC.com>
Cc: 谭明华 <charles_tan@126.com>; Phil Carvelas <pcarvelas@WhitestoneCC.com>; James Dearth <JDearth@WhitestoneCC.com>; ex02 <ex02@yuandacn.com>
Subject: 回复: 回复: CUNY - Building movement @ WT-3

Sorry,Forget the attachment.

Best Regards,
Yuan Yue

---

ex02@yuandacn.com

发件人： ex02@yuandacn.com
发送时间： 2017-03-22 16:40
收件人： plepkowski
抄送： 谭明华; PHIL; jdearth; ex02
主题： 回复: RE: CUNY - Building movement @ WT-3

Dear Pawel,

If the main structure's displacement has reached 3.4", it is indeed too big, far exceeding the displacement that would happen in main structure of normal projects.
However, Yuanda's design and calculation to this system were based on the specification requirements provided to Yuanda in the earlier stage of this project (in reference to 0.763" of WT1 displacement and 0.71" of WT8 displacement). When the curtain wall was being installed, the installation of main structure of the auditorium has completed long time ago, which means displacement of main structure has occurred when the curtain wall was being installed. But under normal condition, curtain wall are not to be installed according to the relative location to structure, but to the structure elevation; so even if there is certain displacement in the main structure during curtain wall installation, as long as the installation was based on the structural elevation, it means the system has absorbed the displacement of main structure occurred previously. Therefore, we think there wouldn't be any problem with our curtain wall system.

Since the amount of displacement in the future is not able to be determined, now the serrated pad in the detail needs to be installed in the other direction, so that the aluminum frame and steel bracket will not be locked together but can occur with sliding when there is certain displacement. Through this way, even if there would be small amount of settlement and displacement, there wouldn't be any problem. But if it is not acceptable to the consultant, or there would be large displacement, then the only way is to change the connecting system on the upper part.

Furthermore, dead load ΔSDL deformation 1.25 has reached 50% currently. Is it accurate? Also, the live load ΔLL deformation has reached 2.15", Yuanda thinks that value is too large. Is there to be a displacement of this amount really? Since both interior side and exterior side are roof, there would be only small amount of live load under normal condition. So that value can be decreased, and that needs to be discussed with the consultant.

Best Regards,
Yuan Yue

---

ex02@yuandacn.com

发件人： Pawel Lepkowski
发送时间： 2017-03-22 05:07
收件人： Ex02
抄送： 谭明华; Phil Carvelas; James Dearth
主题： RE: CUNY - Building movement @ WT-3

Dear Yuan,
We have a meeting with Architect this coming Thursday, one of the main items of concern is building movement, for that reason we need your response by tomorrow so that we can go over it internally prior to meeting on Thursday. Please provide.
Thank you,
Pawel

From: James Dearth
Sent: Thursday, March 9, 2017 3:26 PM
To: Ex02
Cc: 谭明华 ; Pawel Lepkowski ; Phil Carvelas
Subject: CUNY - Building movement @ WT-3
Importance: High
Yuan/Charles,
Please review this condition and advise if system can accommodate building movement.
We need resolution to this ASAP.
Regards,
James Dearth
Project Manager
Whitestone Construction Corp
50-52 49th Street
Woodside, New York 11377
Tel: 718-392-1800
Cell: 347-395-7028
Fax: 718-392-6262